UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,239	10/27/2000	R. Donald Thompson	MSFT115607	5429

26389 7590 09/02/2004

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER	
MAURO JR, THOMAS J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/699,239	THOMPSON, R. DONALD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas J. Mauro Jr.	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 May 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10 May 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are pending and are presented for examination. Claims 19-23 have been newly added. A formal action on the merits of claims 1-23 follows.

2. Objections to both the drawings and the specification have been withdrawn in light of the amendments made to both the drawings and the specification.

3. Rejection set forth under 35 U.S.C 102(e) with respect to Snyder has been withdrawn in light of the amended claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 11-13 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGee (U.S. 6,393,468) in view of Rieth et al. (U.S. 6,134,597).

Regarding claim 1, McGee teaches the invention substantially as claimed, a method in a computer system for association provider data including a first and second portion with a data request, the method comprising:

obtaining a first request for the provider data **[McGee -- Figure 4 and Col. 9 lines 50-66 – Client establishes a connection with the browser to request a page by forwarding the page URL to the server**;

in response to obtaining the first request:

obtaining/associating a first identifier corresponding to the first request **[McGee -- Col. 8 lines 60-67, Col. 9 lines 22-39 and Col. 12 lines 17-18 and lines 46-47 – Session store stores associations between the first request and the client, namely an IP address of the client]**;

associating the first identifier with the request for the provider data **[McGee -- Col. 8 lines 60-67, Col. 9 lines 22-39 and Col. 12 lines 17-18 and lines 46-47 – Session store stores, i.e. associates, the IP address of the client browser which originated the request for data]**;

returning the first portion of the provider data **[McGee -- Col. 11 lines 31-42 – Welcome page containing options available to the user is returned to the client]**;

storing the second portion of the provider data according to the first identifier **[McGee -- Col. 12 lines 13-18 – Second portion of the provider data, i.e. URL to other objects on the page, i.e. page options, are stored based upon the information in the session store, i.e. first identifier, namely the IP address of the client]**;

obtaining a second request for the second portion of the provider data **[McGee -- Col. 12 lines 32-35 – Request for option on welcome page is received as a tokenized URL request]**;

obtaining a second identifier corresponding to the second request and associating this identifier with the second request **[McGee -- Col. 12 lines 32-35 and lines 41-45 – Client IP address, associated with second request, is used for authentication purposes to gain access to stored URL's]**; and

returning the second portion of the provider data if the second identifier matches the first identifier **[McGee -- Col. 12 lines 32-35 and lines 41-52 – If first identifier, i.e. client IP stored in session store and second identifier, i.e. client IP obtained from second request for URL through browser, match, then real URL is retrieved and client can access page pointed by URL; otherwise, access is denied]**.

McGee fails to explicitly teach generating a first and second identifier, upon which, the generated first and second identifiers would be used for storing the data and then retrieving the data if a match occurs.

Rieth teaches a system for storing objects, i.e. data, according to a first hashed, i.e. generated, identifier and later requesting the object stored using a second hashed, i.e. generated, identifier which must match the first hashed, i.e. generated, identifier in order for the client to have access to the stored object **[Rieth – Col. 2 lines 54-60, Col. 2 lines 66-67 – Col. 3 lines 1-4, Col. 4 lines 30-53 and Col. 5 lines 11-15 – Data object is stored according to a first generated, i.e. hashed, identifier and then retrieved only if a match exists with a second generated, i.e. hashed, identifier]**.

Thus Rieth provides the actual generation of a first and second identifier to be used in retrieving a stored data object, the feature which McGee lacks.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate the first and second generated, i.e. hashed, identifiers, as taught by Rieth into the invention of McGee, in order to provide a unique, compressed tag with which to securely store publicly available information.

Regarding claim 2, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including wherein generating the first identifier includes generating a first hash table key corresponding to the request for the provider data; and wherein generating the second identifier includes generating a second hash table key corresponding to the request for the second portion of the provider data **[Rieth -- Col. 2 lines 23-28 – A first and second identifier, namely an IP address, are used to generate both a first hash table key and a second hash table key to access the data stored in the hash table]**.

Regarding claim 3, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 2 above, including wherein generating a first hash table key and generating a second hash table key each include utilizing a provider data IP address to generate the first hash table key and the second hash table key **[Rieth -- Col. 4 lines 30-36 and lines 47-53 – Client IP address, which McGee teaches is both stored and used for authentication, is used in producing the first and second hashed key values]**.

Regarding claim 5, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including wherein the first portion of the provider data

includes a URL of content data **[McGee -- Col. 11 lines 31-42 – First portion provides welcome page listing options available to the user in the form of hyperlinks, i.e. URL's]**.

Regarding claim 7, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 5 above, including wherein the second portion of the provider data includes an HREF relating to the content data **[McGee Col. 11 lines 45-55 and Col. 12 lines 49-52 – URL's implicitly contain underlying HREF's, i.e. addresses, which provide access to other content data]**.

Regarding claim 11, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method of claim 1 **[McGee -- Col. 7 lines 26-54 – Gateways contain processes written in various programming languages stored in a database or other medium for carrying out the various functions]**.

Regarding claim 12, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, including a computer system having a processor, a memory, and an operating system for performing the method of claim 1 **[McGee Col. 1 lines 47-56 and Col. 6 lines 35-47 – System is implemented using UNIX, i.e. operating system, based server platforms, upon which, servers inherently contain processor and a memory]**.

Regarding claim 13, this is a system claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim 1 above. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 13 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 19, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 13 above, including wherein generating a first identifier includes generating a hash key identifier from data relating to the requesting party **[Rieth -- Col. 4 lines 30-61 – Hash key identifier is generated from data relating closely to the requesting party, namely, an IP address, machine serial number, etc.]**.

Regarding claim 20, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 19 above, including wherein the data relating to the requesting party includes a data identifier, an IP address, and data relating to a content request **[McGee -- Col. 8 lines 60-67 and Col. 9 lines 22-39 and lines 55-65, Col. 12 lines 17-18 and lines 43-45 – Data includes a data identifier, i.e. URL, used to access page, IP address of client, and data relating to a content request, i.e. session index]**.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGee (U.S. 6,393,468) and Rieth (U.S. 6,134,597), as applied to claim 2 above, in view of West et al. (U.S. 6,175,833).

Regarding claim 4, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 2 above, including a hash table key generating step **[Rieth -- Col. 2 lines 23-28 – A first and second identifier, namely an IP address, are used to generate both a first hash table key and a second hash table key to access the data stored in the hash table]**, but fails to teach utilizing a graphical user ID to generate the hash table key.

West, however, discloses an online voting system which uses a globally unique identifier (GUID) for the client's browser, i.e. a graphical ID, to validate responses, i.e. votes, of a user **[West -- Col. 5 lines 50-55]**. Use of GUID's is well known in the art and provides a secure and positive mechanism with which to positively identify a particular application a client is using. Therefore, because Rieth is concerned with creating a CRC hashed value using unique values of a user, i.e. IP address and machine serial number **[Rieth -- Col. 4 line 30 and line 45]**, a GUID could be used as a unique identifier when creating the key.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a GUID, as taught by West into the creating of the hash key, as taught by McGee-Rieth, in order to provide further content which is unique to a given program on a given computer to help generate a unique hash key, specific to that client.

7. Claims 6 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGee (U.S. 6,393,468) and Rieth (U.S. 6,134,597), as applied to claims 5, 1 and 13 above respectively, in view of Landsman et al. (U.S. 6,516,338).

Regarding claim 6, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 5 above, but fails to explicitly teach wherein the content data is advertisement media.

Landsman, however, teaches implementing a network distributed advertising system wherein content data, namely, advertising media **[Landsman -- Col. 10 line 4 and Col. 16 lines 63-65 – Advertisement media is downloaded]**, including URL's are received in a webpage **[Landsman -- Col. 10 lines 3-6 and Col. 16 lines 57-65 – Webpage content includes embedded URL's for which advertising content data is located]**.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the receiving of advertising media content, as taught by Landsman into the downloaded pages as taught by McGee-Rieth, in order to provide users with valuable content in which they may be interested in and to further provide the page originator with a reduced cost paid for by advertising fees **[Landsman -- Col. 3 lines 7-12 and Col. 4 lines 25-26]**.

Regarding claim 21, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 13 above, but fails to explicitly teach wherein the first portion of data is associated with an advertisement media and the second portion of the data is a redirection reference to the advertisement media.

Landsman, however, teaches implementing a network distributed advertising system wherein content data, i.e. first portion, namely, advertising media **[Landsman -- Col. 10 line 4 and Col. 16 lines 63-65 – Advertisement media is downloaded]**, including URL's, and underlying

HREF's are received in a webpage **[Landsman -- Col. 10 lines 3-6 and Col. 16 lines 57-65 – Webpage content includes embedded URL's, implicitly having HREF tags to cause operation of the URL's, for which advertising content data is located, i.e. redirect reference]**.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the receiving of advertising media content, as taught by Landsman into the downloaded pages as taught by McGee-Rieth, in order to provide users with valuable content in which they may be interested in and to further provide the page originator with a reduced cost paid for by advertising fees **[Landsman -- Col. 3 lines 7-12 and Col. 4 lines 25-26]**.

Regarding claim 22, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, but fail to explicitly teach storing the second portion of data in a click server.

Landsman, however, discloses a distributed network advertising system which uses a click server, i.e. ad management system server, for storing advertising data **[Landsman -- Figure 1B and Col. 10 lines 10-22]**.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of an ad management system server, i.e. click server for storing ad data, as taught by Landsman into the invention of McGee-Rieth, in order to decouple actual advertising data from a web page which will provide faster load time for a user in viewing the requested data on pages, thereby providing a more pleasing advertising experience **[Landsman -- Col. 9 lines 30-36 and Col. 10 lines 13-19]**.

8. Claims 8-10 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGee (U.S. 6,393,468) and Rieth et al. (U.S. 6,134,597), as applied to claims 1 and 13 above respectively, in view of Bereznyi et al. (U.S. 6,453,404).

Regarding claim 8, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including storing the second portion of provider data according to the first identifier **[McGee -- Col. 12 lines 13-18 – Second portion of the provider data, i.e. URL to other objects on the page, i.e. page options, are stored based upon the information in the session store, i.e. first identifier, namely the IP address of the client]**, but fails to teach storing it in a cache and replicating the data to at least a second cache.

Bereznyi teaches a distributed (multi) data cache system which provides redundant cache servers such that all functions are performed in parallel, i.e. replication **[Bereznyi -- Col. 38 lines 34-46]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate storing the data in a redundant distributed cache with parallel, i.e. replication, functioning, as taught by Bereznyi into the invention of McGee-Rieth, in order to provide fast, fault-tolerant storage of data that is frequently accessed by multiple clients.

Regarding claim 9, McGee-Rieth-Bereznyi teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 8 above, including requesting data from a first cache and if no match

is found, requesting it from a second cache **[Bereznyi -- Col. 31 lines 40-43 and Col. 38 lines 51-57 – Because the remote caches are redundant and share the same data, if an access for data on one fails for whatever reason, the request can use another cache to get the needed data]**.

Regarding claim 10, McGee-Rieth-Bereznyi teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 9 above, wherein the step of requesting the data from a second cache includes requesting the data from at least two or more caches **[Bereznyi -- Figures 4, 5 and Col. 38 lines 34-46 and lines 51-57 – Because all caches operate parallel to each other and fault-tolerance is achieved by redundancy, the request for data would be sent out to multiple (2 or more) caches to retrieve the data]**.

Regarding claim 14, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 13 above, but fails to teach a cache on the server for storing data. Bereznyi, however, teaches a distributed cache system for storing redundant data **[Bereznyi -- Figures 4, 5 and Col. 38 lines 34-46]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate storing the data in a redundant distributed cache, as taught by Bereznyi into the invention of McGee-Rieth, in order to provide fast, fault-tolerant storage of data that is frequently accessed by multiple clients.

Regarding claim 15, McGee-Rieth-Bereznyi teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 14 above, including having the content server cache store the second portion of data **[Bereznyi -- Figures 4, 5 and Col. 38 lines 34-46]** and storing the data in a hash table which can be accessed using a hash key from the first and second identifiers **[Rieth -- Col. 2 lines 23-28 – A first and second identifier are used to generate a hash table key to access the data stored in the hash table]**.

9. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGee (U.S. 6,393,468), Rieth et al. (U.S. 6,134,597) and Bereznyi et al. (U.S. 6,453,404), as applied to claim 14 above, in view of Landsman et al. (U.S. 6,516,338).

Regarding claim 16, McGee-Rieth-Bereznyi teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 15 above, but fail to explicitly teach a click server in communication with the content server for storing and recalling the second portion of data.

Landsman, however, discloses a distributed network advertising system which uses a click server, i.e. ad management system server, for storing and recalling advertising data **[Landsman -- Figure 1B and Col. 10 lines 10-22]**.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of an ad management system server, i.e. click server for storing and recalling ad data, as taught by Landsman into the invention of McGee-Rieth-Bereznyi, in order to decouple actual advertising data from a web page which will provide faster load time for a

user in viewing the requested data on pages, thereby providing a more pleasing advertising experience **[Landsman -- Col. 9 lines 30-36 and Col. 10 lines 13-19]**.

Regarding claim 17, McGee-Rieth-Bereznyi-Landsman teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 16 above, wherein the click server includes two or more cache for storing the second portion of the provider data **[Bereznyi -- Figures 4, 5 and Col. 38 lines 34-46 – Multiple caches exist in the distributed cache system for storing the data]**.

Regarding claim 18, McGee-Rieth-Bereznyi-Landsman teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 17 above, wherein the two or more cache contain identical contents **[Bereznyi -- Col. lines 34-46 – Redundant caches operate in parallel and contain identical data, i.e. redundancy]**.

10. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGee (U.S. 6,393,468), Rieth et al. (U.S. 6,134,597) and Landsman et al. (U.S. 6,516,338), as applied to claim 22 above, in view of Bereznyi et al. (U.S. 6,453,404) and further in view of Wilson et al. (U.S. 6,738,821).

Regarding claim 23, McGee-Rieth teach the invention substantially as claimed, including a click server **[Landsman -- Figure 1B and Col. 10 lines 10-22 - Click server, i.e. ad**

management system server, stores advertising data], but fail to teach a virtual interface (VI) protocol and a plurality of cache servers for storing the second portion of the data.

Bereznyi, however, discloses a plurality of cache servers which store a portion of the provider data **[Bereznyi -- Figures 4, 5 and Col. 38 lines 34-46 – Multiple caches exist in the distributed cache system for storing the data]**.

In addition, Wilson discloses an Ethernet storage protocol enabled network for receiving data over a network which employs the use of a virtual interface (VI) protocol **[Wilson -- Col. 7 lines 54-58 and Col. 25 lines 45-51]**.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a plurality of cache servers for storing portions of provider data, as taught by Bereznyi, along with a virtual interface protocol (VI), as taught by Wilson into the invention of McGee-Rieth-Landsman, in order to and further to provide fast, fault-tolerant storage of data that is frequently accessed by multiple clients in addition to providing a protocol that removes excess overhead and is optimized for storage which enables fast and efficient utilization in networks **[Wilson -- Col. 3 lines 5-10]**.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Schmeidler et al. (U.S. 6,763,370) discloses a system for securely delivering on-demand content over a network which uses generated identifiers for security validation before delivering content.

- Pollack (U.S. 6,505,236) discloses a network based mail attachment storage system which returns an E-mail (first portion) containing an attachment by reference which is used to download an attachment (second portion) stored on a network server through the use of a generated handle.

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mauro Jr. whose telephone number is 703-605-1234. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TJM

August 23, 2004
TJM

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100